

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending and rejected. Claims 1, 11, and 16 have been amended and claim 7 was cancelled. The applicants request reconsideration of all the rejected claims.

### I. Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-20 were rejected based on double patenting. The applicants have submitted a terminal disclaimer herewith to overcome the rejection.

### II. Rejection of Claims 1-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Golberstein (U.S. 5,103,106).

#### CLAIM 1

Claim 1, as amended herein, is reprinted as follows for convenience:

An optical navigation device comprising:

a light source for illuminating a surface with a narrow bandwidth beam at an angle of illumination with respect to said surface; ~~and~~

a detector positioned at an angle of reflection with respect to said surface operable to receive a reflected portion of said narrow bandwidth beam, wherein said angle of reflection is substantially equal to said angle of illumination; and

**a filter positioned between said light source and said surface.**

Some portions of claim 1 that are not disclosed or rendered obvious by Golberstein. The applicants have amended claim 1 to include the filter of claim 7, which has been cancelled herein.

There is no “filter positioned between said light source and said surface” as claimed in claim 1 disclosed or suggested in Golberstein. In addition, there is no mention or suggestion of such a filter in Golberstein. Accordingly, Golberstein cannot render claim 1 obvious.

Based on the foregoing, the rejection of claim 1 has been overcome and the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

#### CLAIMS 2-6 AND 8-10

Claims 2-6 and 8-10 are dependent on claim 1 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Accordingly, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

#### CLAIM 11

Claim 11, as amended herein, is reprinted as follows for convenience:

A system for controlling a positional pointer on a video screen of a computer using a mouse to detect relative motion with respect to a surface, said system comprising:

means for generating narrow bandwidth specular reflection images, each said narrow bandwidth scatter pattern being specific to a portion of said surface over which said mouse moves;

**a filter located between said means for generating and said surface; and**

means for converting said specific narrow bandwidth specular reflection images into signals corresponding to relative motion between said mouse and said surface.

Some portions of claim 11 that are not disclosed or rendered obvious by Golberstein. The applicants have amended claim 11 to include the filter of claim 7, which has been cancelled herein.

There is no "filter located between said means for generating and said surface" as claimed in claim 11 disclosed or suggested in Golberstein. In addition, there is no mention or suggestion of such a filter in Golberstein. Accordingly, Golberstein cannot render claim 11 obvious.

Based on the foregoing, the rejection of claim 11 has been overcome and the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

#### CLAIMS 12-15

Claims 12-15 are dependent on claim 11 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Accordingly, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

#### CLAIM 16

Claim 16, as amended herein, is reprinted as follows for convenience:

A method for determining relative motion between an optical navigation device and a surface, said method comprising:

providing a narrow bandwidth light beam at an angle of illumination with respect to said surface for illuminating said surface; ~~and~~  
**providing a filter positioned in said light beam; and**

receiving a reflected portion of said narrow bandwidth light beam at an angle of reflection with respect to said surface, such that said angle of reflection is substantially equal to said angle of illumination.

Some portions of claim 16 that are not disclosed or rendered obvious by Golberstein. The applicants have amended claim 16 to include the filter of claim 7, which has been cancelled herein.

There is no "filter positioned in the light beam" as claimed in claim 16 disclosed or suggested in Golberstein. In addition, there is no mention or suggestion of such a filter in Golberstein. Accordingly, Golberstein cannot render claim 16 obvious.

Based on the foregoing, the rejection of claim 16 has been overcome and the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

#### CLAIMS 17-20

Claims 17-20 are dependent on claim 16 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Accordingly, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

In view of the above, all of the pending claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

By: /Robert W. Nelson/  
Robert W. Nelson  
Reg. No. 37,898  
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225

Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 298-9888  
Fax: (303) 297-2266